DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 027 130 RC 003 283

By-Schwarzweller, Harry K.
Family Ties, Migration, and Transitional Adjustment of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky.
Kentucky Univ., Lexington. Agricultural Experiment Station.
Spons Agency-Department of Agriculture, Washington, D.C.; Kentucky Univ., Lexington.
Report No-BULL-691
Pub Date May 64
Note-39p.
EDRS Price MF-$0.25 HC-$2.05
Descriptors-*Adjustment Problems, Family Mobility, *Family Relationship, Males, *Migration, Migration Patterns, Occupational Mobility, Rural Family, *Rural Youth, *Social Adjustment
Identifiers-Kentucky

The project was designed to follow up a specific population of young men from a relatively isolated ruralarea of eastern Kentucky who had been out of eighth grade for 10 years. The sample was drawn from enrollment lists for the school year 1949-50, obtained from 11 counties. The objective of the study was to investigate differences between migrant (youths who had moved to areas outside eastern Kentucky) and nonmigrant segments of the population. Conclusions indicated that the social situation of the migrant was not favorable for replacing family ties, resulting in the migrant's identifcation more with the home area than with the urban communiy; this in turn reinforced the migrant's definition of his situation as one of transiency rather than permanency. Related documents are RC 003 282 and ED 019 157. (JM)

ED027130

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

Bulletin 691 May 1964

Family Ties, Migration, and Transitional Adjustment of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky

By HARRY K. SCHWARZWELLER

(Filing Code 26)

University of Kentucky
Agricultural Experiment Station
Lexington

In cooperation with

Farm Population Branch, Economic and Statistical Analysis Division,
Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture

RC003283

CONTENTS

Page

PREFACE 3

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS 4

INTRODUCTION 5

STUDY DESIGN AND PROCEDURES: A BRIEF REVIEW 6

SECTION ONE: FAMILISTIC ORIENTATION AND MIGRATION SELECTIVITY 7

SECTION TWO: FAMILY TIES AND MIGRATION 12

- Family-Household Structure and Migration 12
- Nearness to Parental Home and Migration 13
- Interaction With Family-of-Origin and Migration 14
- Nearness and Interaction With Parental Family 14
- Mutual Aid Function of Familistic Structure and Migration 15
- Nuclear Family Structure and Migration 18
- Interaction with Parents-in-law and Migration 19
- Neighborhood Ties and Migration 20
- Summary: Family Ties, Migration, and Nostalgia for Home 23

SECTION THREE: FAMILY TIES AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS 25

- Compensatory Structures in the Transition Process 27
- Extra-Familial Group Involvement and Family Ties 31
- Residential Stability and Family Ties 33
- Anomia and Family Ties 34
- Occupational Achievement and Family Ties 36

SECTION FOUR: SUMMARY FAMILY TIES, MIGRATION, AND TRANSITIONAL ADJUSTMENT 38

PREFACE

This is the third of a series of reports on a study of young men who were enrolled in the 8th grade during the school year 1949-50 in 11 eastern Kentucky counties. These men were followed up and interviewed where they lived in the summer of 1960.

The first report[1] compared those individuals who, at that time, were residing within eastern Kentucky with those who had migrated and taken up residence outside that area; sociocultural origins as well as migration patterns were discussed. The second report[2] focused on the effects of migration and education upon the career placement and economic life chances of these youths.

The present report deals with familism and its influence on the processes of migration and the transitional adjustment of migrants in a new situation.

It is anticipated that this information will be of particular interest and value to guidance counselors, school administrators, county extension agents, and others who are concerned with what happens to eastern Kentucky youths after they leave school.

A more detailed, technical explanation of the research design, field work procedures, and estimation of the study population's representativeness is available (RS Report 21) from the Rural Sociology Department, University of Kentucky, Lexington.

---

[1] Harry K. Schwarzweller, *Sociocultural Origins and Migration Patterns of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky*, Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 685 (Dec. 1963).

[2] Harry K. Schwarzweller, *Career Placement and Economic Life Chances of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky*, Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 686 (Jan. 1964).

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The study on which this report is based was made under the direction of E. Grant Youmans, Social Science Analyst, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and Harry K. Schwarzweller, Assistant Professor of Rural Sociology, University of Kentucky. It was sponsored jointly by the Department of Rural Sociology, University of Kentucky, and the Farm Population Branch, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture, and is a contributing study to the Southern Regional Rural Sociological Research Project S-44.

Acknowledgements are made to Martin Jay Crowe and Dennis Dedrick, graduate assistants; Gladys K. Bowles, James D. Cowhig, and Lee G. Burchinal, of the Economic Research Service, U.S.D.A.; Silvio O. Navarro, Director of the University Computing Center; to all the members of the Rural Sociology Department for technical assistance and advice; to the school superintendents in the cooperating counties; and to Mrs. Azada Henry, research assistant during the early phases of the project.

Family Ties, Migration, and Transitional Adjustment of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky

By HARRY K. SCHWARZWELLER

Eastern Kentucky is, in many respects, a familistic society. The familistic orientation characterizing social relationships within the subregion, supported by other values such as traditionalism and puritanism, tends to be perpetuated by the institutions of that society.[3] Furthermore, the relative isolation of this area in the past from the mainstream of American society has helped to preserve those cultural vestiges of a family-centered social organization which were necessary, indeed, crucial, for survival during the earlier, frontier situation.[4]

Nevertheless external influences were introduced and standards of "the good life" changed, bringing about not only a wider scope of interest in material conveniences and new meanings to the possession of physical amenities, but also an increase in the motivational intensity by which such material goals are pursued.[5] Since the economic base of the subregion cannot adequately support the rapidly expanding population in the face of an even more rapidly expanding quest for economic opportunity, and since the area itself is not very suitable for large-scale industrial development, external disturbances of the traditional familistic system induced an extensive and, over the past three decades, consistent stream of out-migration.[6]

Out-migrants from eastern Kentucky tend to be young people seeking jobs in the industrial centers of the Ohio Valley.[7] Although

---

[3] For an excellent description of the familistically-oriented cultural configuration characteristic of rural communities in eastern Kentucky, see: James S. Brown, *The Family Group in a Kentucky Mountain Farming Community*, Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 588 (June 1952).

[4] For an analysis of this isolation, see: Harry K. Schwarzweller and James S. Brown, "Education as a Cultural Bridge Between Eastern Kentucky and the Great Society," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 27 (Dec. 1962), pp. 357-373.

[5] The scope of interest in material conveniences expressed by the study population upon which the present report is based, is discussed in: Schwarzweller, *op. cit., Career Placement and Economic Life Chances of Young Men from Eastern Kentucky.*

[6] Recent statistics on this stream of out-migration are presented by: James S. Brown and Ralph J. Ramsey, *The Changing Kentucky Population*, Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Progress Report 67 (Sept. 1958).

[7] *Ibid.*, Tables 22, 23 and 24.

one usually thinks of migration as individuals responding to personal values in a context of unfavorably perceived situational circumstances, it is useful to view it also as a response on the part of the family system to the prevailing socio-economic conditions in the area of origin. The latter approach is how LePlay, so many years ago, conceived the role of the *famille-souche* (stem family).[8]

As previously mentioned, the current publication aims to shed more light on the out-migration of youths from a low-income, traditionally familistic, relatively isolated rural area of the Southern Appalachian Region. The specific research interest, here, was with the entry of these youths into the industrial labor force and how extended family ties facilitated or interfered with the process of transitional adjustment to social circumstances in the areas of destination.[9] Two interrelated propositions guided the analysis: (1) in this type of migration the reduction of face-to-face interaction with family-of-origin is a source of structural strain within the migration system, and (2) strong parental family ties tend to hold back the migrant from becoming socially integrated into the urban, industrial society.[10]

Several problems relevant to the analysis were examined. Within limits imposed by the study design, an attempt was made to explore to what extent familism affects the decision to migrate. Also, comparisons between migrant and nonmigrant situations were considered.

STUDY DESIGN AND PROCEDURES: A BRIEF REVIEW[11]

The project was designed to follow up a specific population of young men who had been 10 years out of the eighth grade and, therefore, would normally have completed formal education and com-

---

[8] An attempt to view eastern Kentucky out-migration in terms of LePlay's conceptualization of the stem-family system is described by: James S. Brown, Harry K. Schwarzweller, and Joseph J. Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem Family: An American Variation on a Theme by LePlay," *Rural Sociology*, Vol. 28 (March 1963), 48-69.

[9] For an appropriate theoretical background, see: Talcott Parsons, "The Social Structure of the Family," in Ruth N. Ashen, editor, *The Family: Its Function and Destiny*, New York: Harper, 1949, pp. 191-192. Other writings by Parsons also suggest the point, namely, that an extended family structure is incompatible with the demands of a modern, complex industrial order. On the other hand, Litwak takes a more modified position; see Eugene Litwak, "Geographic Mobility and Extended Family Cohesion," *American Sociological Review*, Vol. 25 (June 1960), pp. 385-394.

[10] The concept "Migration system", as used here, is explained by Brown, Schwarzweller, and Mangalam, *op. cit.*

[11] For a more comprehensive treatment of the study design, see: Harry K. Schwarzweller, *Research Design, Field Work Procedures, and Data Collection Problems in a Follow-Up Study of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky*, University of Kentucky, Rural Sociology Department, RS 21 (May 1963).

pulsory military service and would likely be established in their work careers. Eighth grade enrollment lists for the school year 1949-50 were obtained from 11 eastern Kentucky counties.[12] Various methods were used to ascertain the 1960 whereabouts of these young men. Field work was limited to the Ohio-Kentucky area and a team of trained interviewers administered the interview schedule during the early summer months of 1960. In total, 307 interviews were completed; these provided the data upon which this and other reports in this series were based.

A "nonmigrant" is defined as an individual who, in 1960 lived *within* the eastern Kentucky area included in State Economic Areas 8 and 9 as delineated by the U.S. Census. "Migrant," on the other hand, refers to an individual who in 1960 lived *outside* the eastern Kentucky area. Though migrants in this study were located in widely scattered areas of the southern Ohio Valley they were mostly concentrated in and around the cities of Middletown, Dayton, Hamilton, Cincinnati, in Ohio and Louisville, Kentucky; a few were in or near Lexington, Kentucky.[13]

SECTION ONE:
FAMILISTIC ORIENTATION AND MIGRATION SELECTIVITY

An earlier report showed that the nonmigrants, as well as the migrants, were aware of regional differentials in work opportunities.[14] For example, over 70 percent of the migrants, compared with only 6 percent of the nonmigrants, rated their present county of residence as a "good" place to find work.

This apparent similarity in awareness about opportunities associated with inter-regional migration and the fact that the migrants did migrate, suggest that the two segments differed in terms of sociocultural, motivational, or situational antecedents. It is plausible, for example, that an individual's orientation or commitment to his extended family is one such antecedent factor. Such an individual would be reluctant to move even though he realized that better jobs were available elsewhere; his familistic orientation, thus, would create a barrier to an improved situation.

---

[12] Breathitt, Elliott, Estill, Jackson, Lee, Magoffin, Menifee, Morgan, Owsley, Powell, and Wolfe counties. See Fig. 1, in *op. cit.*, Ky. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bul. 685.

[13] A more detailed account of the background characteristics of these young men, and a descriptive analysis of their residential mobility during the 10 year period, is found in Schwarzweller, *op. cit., Sociocultural Origins and Migration Patterns, etc.*

[14] Schwarzweller, *op. cit., The Career Placement and Economic Life Chances, etc.*

An individual's orientation to a value system is based in large measure upon his socialization experiences during his formative years. A clue as to the nature of these experiences and their associated value orientations may be found in his sociocultural background. When the migrants and nonmigrants were compared with respect to a number of background factors (number of siblings, type of job held by father, occupational status of father, education of father and mother, rural farm or nonfarm background, level of schooling completed) no statistically significant differences were revealed.[15] Thus, one can say that these two segments stemmed apparently from similar sociocultural circumstances, and probably were exposed to a somewhat similar range of socialization experiences during their early years when value orientations were set.

Although it was not possible to test directly the hypothesis that the migrants were less strongly attached to their extended families at the time of migration than the nonmigrants, it was possible to explore to what extent these two segments differed after a period of time with respect to certain attitudes generally associated with familism.[16]

In the interview schedule several attitudinal statements designed to measure selected aspects of familism were interspersed as "buffer" statements between items measuring different attitudes. Respondents had three choices: agree, disagree or undecided. Question-by-question comparative analysis of the percent agreement by nonmigrants and migrants revealed very little difference. (Table 1). For only one of the six items was a statistically significant, although very weak, association noted (item D).

However, it was observed that in all cases a larger proportion of nonmigrants, compared with migrants, responded in familistic terms. Because the battery of items was not scalable, a combined six-item summary index was constructed on the basis of item-total score analysis. All items were significantly related to the total score with tetrachoric estimates ranging from 0.35 to 0.50.[17] Total scores were consolidated into four categories, (1) hi-high scores, (2) high scores, (3) low scores, and (4) lo-low scores. The division between high scores and low scores was made at a natural break in the frequency

---

[15] For supportive data, see: Schwarzweller, *op. cit.*, *The Sociocultural Origins and Migration Patterns, etc.*

[16] Familism, as a concept, is discussed by: P. A. Sorokin, C. A. Zimmerman, and C. J. Galpin, *A Systematic Source Book in Rural Sociology*, Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press, Vol. II, 1931, pp. 41-48 and by Ernest W. Burgess and Harvey J. Locke, *The Family*, New York: American Book Company, 1945, pp. 69-92.

[17] James E. Wert, Charles O. Neidt and J. Stanley Ahmann, *Statistical Methods*, New York: Appleton-Century-Crofts, Inc., 1954, pp. 302-303.

Table 1.— Percent of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky Expressing a Familistic Response to Indicated Statements, by Region of Residence, 1962

Statement	Region of Residence 1962		χ^2 Test of Difference
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants) % Familistic	Outside E. Kentucky (migrants) % Familistic	
A. Even if it is against his family's wishes, a man should choose a job that he thinks best for himself. [a]	69.8	9.8	9.79
B. If a man loves his job, he should be able to tell back on his relatives for support.	89.6	88.5	0.46
C. A person should always consider the needs and interests of his family and parents as more important than his own.	63.5	45.8	9.79
D. A person should be able to count on financial support from his family if he needs it.	87.1	64.7	4.79[b]
E. A person should financially support his relatives if they are in need.	86.5	69.7	9.46
F. A man should share his home with his wife's parents if they are in need.	87.5	66.9	9.11
	No. = 156	No. = 150	

[a] A negative response to statement A is classed as "familistic." For all other statements, a positive response is considered "familistic."
[b] Significant at the 0.05 level; all others are nonsignificant.

distribution which had yielded highest item-total score correlations. Ranking on this familism attitude index was associated significantly with region of present residence; a little over one-half of the nonmigrants but only about one-third of the migrants were included in the high familism categories (Table 2).

Table 2.— Composite Score on Familism Attitude Index of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1962

Familism Attitude Composite Score	Region of Residence 1962			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Hi-high score	20	13.0	10	6.8
High score	69	46.4	37	24.7
Low score	43	27.6	53	36.7
Lo-low score	30	19.2	48	32.0
Total	156	100.0	150	100.0

$\chi^2 = 15.38$, $DF = 3$, $P < 0.01$

These observations suggest that the migrants tended to be less strongly attached to attitudes associated with a "familistic orientation." However, this conclusion must be regarded as highly tentative for these reasons: (1) the items were not scalable; (2) even though a reasonable degree of internal consistency was established by item-total score analysis, the extent to which the composite score taps a unidimensional attribute was not demonstrated; (3) the individual items did not differentiate significantly, except in one instance, between the two segments; and (4) the composite familism score, therefore, at best makes only a coarse distinction.[18] It may well be that observed differences were a consequence of intervening cultural experience after migration.

This latter explanation is supported, in part, by the observed tendency for the composite familism score to be negatively associated with the length of time the migrant youth had resided outside of the eastern Kentucky area.[19] The degree of difference, however, was not statistically significant ($X^2 = 1.57$; $DF = 3$; $P>0.05$) and can be regarded only as suggestive.

If one considers that some migrants moved with or joined their parents, then he might argue that this would tend to influence relationships between migration and familistic orientations. In a sense, the true migrant in this case was an individual who, to some extent, severed ties with his family-of-origin. When migration was defined as spatial distance from parental home, there was a significant relationship between migration and the composite familistic orientation score ($X^2 = 3.86$; $DF = 1$; $P<0.05$).[20] However, the association was less strong than the earlier observations and this further supported the notion that the cultural situation in the areas of destination had eroding influence on familistic orientations after migration.

It has been stated elsewhere that completion of high school is

---

[18] Furthermore, one should remember that the attitudinal content of statements used to construct the familism index focuses largely on economic aspects of the supportive function of an extended family system which is only one dimension of the general concept, "familism." Thus, for example, it is not surprising to find that low score on familism index is associated ($X^2 = 6.89$, $DF = 1$, $P<0.01$) with negative reply to the question "During the past year, did you help your parents or other relatives with money or in any other way?"

[19] Only 29 percent of the earlier migrants (six or more years continuous residence outside eastern Kentucky) as compared with 40 percent of the more recent migrants (less than three years continuous residence outside eastern Kentucky) scored "high" on this familism index.

[20] About 48 percent of those young men in the total study population who resided with their parents or nearby (within 100 miles) as compared with 36 percent of those who resided farther away (more than 100 miles) scored "high" on this familism index.

associated with influences that weaken the familistic orientation characteristic of the eastern Kentucky subculture.[21] This hypothesis was not supported for the present population ($X^2 = 0.62$; DF = 1; $P>0.05$). Those young men who completed high school did not reflect a lesser degree of familistic orientation than those who had not.

It can be argued also that a familistic orientation, particularly when familism is viewed as individual obligation and responsibility to the extended family, is related to stage in the family life cycle. As noted, the measurement of familism in this study largely reflected monetary obligations. Consequently, one would expect that individuals who are more involved in their nuclear family and have assumed the responsibilities associated with the role of nuclear family "breadwinner" would be less likely to identify with the extended family or to adhere to familistic obligations of an economic nature. Data from the present study tended to support this reasoning; however, statistically significant differences were not demonstrated ($X^2 = 2.24$; DF = 3; $P>0.05$).[22]

In summary, an attempt was made to explore to what extent familism affected the decision to migrate. Migrants and nonmigrants did not differ in sociocultural background characteristics. A composite index of familistic orientation constructed from six attitudinal items revealed some differences between migrants and nonmigrants. Migrants, on the whole, tended to be less familistic. This difference may be explained, in part, by the influence of urban, industrial experiences in the areas of destination, also, in part, by the stage in the family life cycle of individuals. Proportionately more migrants, as shown in a following section, were married and had children.[23] Thus, a familistic orientation seemingly did not have as much bearing upon the decision of young men to migrate as one might expect on the basis of the classic "push-pull" hypothesis or from the results in Table 2.

These data, then, do not negate the hypothesis that the extended family system legitimizes the geographic mobility of its members in situations where external circumstances are unfavorable for the maintenance of the family.[24] Likely the situation in which the young man finds himself when seeking work has as much if not more to do with his decision about migrating than his degree of "attachment" to

---

[21] Schwarzweller and Brown, *op. cit.*, "Education as a Cultural Bridge."

[22] Only 40 percent of those married youths with one or more children as compared with 50 percent of those youths not married or married with no children scored "high" on this familism index.

[23] See Section Two of this report.

[24] This hypothesis was advanced by Frederic LePlay, *Les ouvriers europeens*, 2nd ed., 6 vols., Paris, 1878.

extended family. Thus, the situationally-induced separation of young men from family-of-origin, assuming a more or less similar commitment to the extended family on their part as on the part of those young men who do not find it necessary to migrate, may create a source of structural strain within the migration system. How migrants cope with such a strain-producing situation is, of course, a problem in the transitional adjustment process.

SECTION TWO: FAMILY TIES AND MIGRATION

This section explores changes in the structure of family and kinship relationships which may be attributed to migration and which, therefore, may be a source of strain in the process of migration. The young men in the study were reared in a family-centered subcultural situation and migrated to industrial centers in the Ohio Valley. Most of them modified their relationships with their families of origin. The nature of this break should indicate at what points in the migration system structural strains may occur.

Although migration is a statistical norm for this age group in eastern Kentucky, for the purpose of analysis it was assumed that the nonmigrant situation reflected the culturally anticipated circumstances which serve as standards in the socialization of eastern Kentucky youths.

Family-Household Structure and Migration

First, differences in the structure of family-households for youths within and those outside of the eastern Kentucky area will be considered. The pattern of family-households was a great deal more nucleated for the migrants than for nonmigrants (Table 3). About a third of the nonmigrants, but only a small fraction of the migrants,

Table 3.— Structure of Family-Household Situation of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Structure of Family-Household	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Youths live with ---				
Parents	49	31.4	5	3.4
Wife's parents	6	3.8	2	1.4
Nuclear family only	95	60.9	114	77.0
Other kin only	3	1.9	20	13.5
Alone or with non-kin only	3	1.9	7	4.7
Total [a]/	156	100.0	148	100.0

[a]/Information on three respondents was not ascertainable.

lived with their parental families. A considerably larger proportion of the migrants, on the other hand, lived with their nuclear family only, with other kin only, with nonkin only, or alone. On the basis of the classification used in Table 3, most of the migrants were structurally separated from the parental family, whereas the nonmigrants were, for the most part, structurally integrated into parental households.

Further analysis revealed that only about 15 percent of those youths living with their parents were married. The norm, then, for both segments was to establish a separate household after marriage. On the other hand, of the unmarried youths, about 71 percent lived with parents, 16 percent nearby or within short driving distance of parents, and only 13 percent lived over 100 miles from parental homes.[25] Migration and its associated structural separation from parental household were associated with the marital status of these youths. This point will be examined in greater detail in a following section.

Nearness to Parental Home and Migration

Migration from one subregion to another was associated not only with structural separation but also with spatial separation of youths from their family-of-origin. Over 68 percent of the migrants lived more than 100 miles from parental homes (Table 4). On the other hand, only 12 percent of the nonmigrants lived more than 10 miles

Table 4.— Nearness to Parental Home of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Nearness to Parental Home (in Miles)	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Live with parents	49	32.0	5	3.4
Nearby, within 10 miles	85	55.6	17	11.5
11-100 miles away	17	11.1	25	16.9
101-200 miles away	2	1.3	74	50.0
201 or more miles away	0	-	27	18.2
Total	153	100.0	148	100.0

from parental homes. This reflects the lack of economic opportunity within the eastern Kentucky area.

One should note, however, that nearly a third of the migrants lived with parents nearby or not more than 100 miles distant. Some of these men moved to areas outside eastern Kentucky which are relatively

[25] These findings were based upon the analysis of additional data not presented in Table 3.

close to their home counties. Some moved with parents, joined them, or their parents followed. There were many variations in the pattern of migration, as discussed in an earlier report.[26] The significant category, however, for the purposes of the present study was those migrants who lived more than 100 miles from parental homes. These are the young men who had modified certain ties with their parental families. The transitional adjustments they made, therefore, were of particular interest; a latter portion of this report will focus specifically on them.

Interaction With Family-of-Origin and Migration

Spatial separation from parental family, in itself, does not indicate that a severance or modification of familial ties has occurred. However, it is clear from Table 5 that migration was associated with a sharp reduction in frequency of interaction with family-of-origin. Nearly

Table 5.— Frequency of Visiting Parents, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Frequency of Visiting	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Daily [a]/	94	61.4	12	8.2
Weekly	52	34.0	25	17.0
Monthly	6	3.9	57	38.8
Few times a year	1	-	51	34.7
Yearly or less	0	-	2	-
Total	153	100.0	147	100.0

[a]/Includes those who lived with parents.

two-thirds of the nonmigrants visited their parents daily, and only a small proportion, about 4 percent, visited less often than once a week. On the other hand, over one-third of the migrants visited parents only a few times a year, and only about one-fourth visited weekly or more often.

Nearness and Interaction With Parental Family

Even in this era of earth orbiting, geographical nearness is highly associated with frequency of interaction. As for this study population, the correlation coefficient between these two variables was estimated to be on the order of –0.87 (Table 6).[27] Frequency of interaction was

[26] Schwarzweller, *op. cit., Sociocultural Origins and Migration Patterns, etc.*

[27] This correlation coefficient is based upon a method suggested by Peters and Voorhis for use in situations dealing with too few class intervals to justify the usual technique for product-moment correlation. C. C. Peters and W. R. Voorhis, *Statistical Procedures and Their Mathematical Bases,* New York: McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., 1940, pp. 393-399.

reduced in almost direct relation to degree of spatial separation, at least within limits imposed by the categories employed for this analysis.

Table 6.— Frequency of Visiting Parents, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Nearness to Parental Home

Frequency of Visiting	Nearness to Parental Home									
	Live with Parents		Nearby Within 10 Miles		11-100 Miles		101-200 Miles		201 or More Miles	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	54	100.0	50	48.5	2	-	-	-	-	-
Weekly			49	47.6	23	54.8	5	6.7	-	-
Monthly			2	-	15	35.7	39	52.0	7	25.9
Less than monthly			1	-	2	-	31	41.3		74.1
Total	54	100.0	102	100.0	42	100.0	75	100.0	27	100.0

r = 0.84 r, corrected for course groupings, = 0.87

Yet, considerable interaction was maintained despite distance and the treacherous roads characteristic of the route home from the Ohio Valley. Half of the young men who lived over 100 miles from their parents visited home (or were visited by their parents) at least once a month.[28] This fact is indicative again of the situation demonstrated earlier in respect to the familistic orientation pattern; individual variation away from the central tendency was slight. Family ties were a strong, tenacious link in the migration system.

Now, let us explore another kind of tie between these youths and their families. The introductory discussion which follows will serve to introduce also the remainder of the analyses in this section.

Mutual Aid Function of Familistic Structure and Migration

A particular social structure, or substructural part of a social system, such as the extended family, can perform numerous functions, and usually does, within the context of a larger system. Likewise, a particular function which needs to be performed by the larger system in order to maintain the integration of that system, can be the legitimated function of two or more structural units at the same time. The latter is often referred to as the "functional equivalence" of social structures. Furthermore, if a particular structure within the larger system fails to perform necessary functions because of changing or unfavorable external circumstances, functional transference to *com-*

[28] The variable "frequency of interaction" was measured by response to the question: "Counting visits to them as well as their visits here, how often do you see your parents?"

pensatory structures may occur.[29] Numerous illustrations of functional transference can be cited; the centralization of governmental services from a local to a state level and both to a federal level is an excellent example of this phenomenon in contemporary society.

In the case of rural-to-urban migrants, economic, psychological, and other kinds of supportive functions traditionally performed by the kinship structure in the areas of origin, may be transferred to other kinship or nonkinship structures in the areas of destination. Since frequency of interaction with parental family is reduced in almost direct relation to degree of spatial separation, and because both variables are interrelated concomitants of migration, one expected that certain supportive ties with the family-of-origin would be modified also in the process of migration. In other words, interactional separation was likely to bring about functional separation as well.

In a rural, low-income, familistic subculture, mutual aid between family members is a virtual necessity for individual survival and well being. Migrants, on the other hand, situated in more favorable economic circumstances, would not need such assistance to the same extent as their nonmigrant counterparts. This expected difference was reflected in answers to the question: "During the past year, did your parents or other relatives help you with money or in any other way?" About 60 percent of the nonmigrants said "yes", compared with only 24 percent of the migrants (Table 7).[30] Help received usually came directly from parents; only 10 percent of the nonmigrants and 22 percent of the migrants reported receiving aid from other sources.

As for migrants, 40 percent of the aid received was in the form of money, but only 3 percent in some form of work exchange. In the case of nonmigrants, only 24 percent was in money form, whereas 26 percent was work exchange. A variety of other types of aid received made up the remainders in each case.

Thus, a much larger proportion of nonmigrants, as compared with

---

[29] Empirically, functional transference can be determined in a number of ways. For example, if an individual is becoming more involved in and identified with one structure and less with another, we have strong inferential evidence that a functional transference has occurred. The problem remains, however, of specifying *what* functions are being transferred.

[30] For an excellent review of the literature on this subject of mutual aid between parents and married children, see: Marvin B. Sussman and Lee G. Burchinal, "Parental Aid to Married Children: Implications for Family Functioning," *Marriage and Family Living*, 24 (Nov. 1962), 320-332. These authors make the pertinent point that "financial aid exchanged between parents and their married children is one of the activities which binds together nuclear units of the kin family network along generational lines."

Table 7.— Help Received From Parents or Relatives During Past Year, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Help Received	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	93	59.6	36	24.0
No	63	40.4	114	76.0
Total	156	100.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 39.68$, DF = 1, $P < 0.01$

migrants, received help from their parents. The type of aid received tended to reflect the economic situation of the respective area.

If the migrant was in a relatively more advantaged economic situation and if family ties were not modified a great deal in the process of migration, then one would expect that migrants would give help to parents and relatives in greater degree than their nonmigrant counterparts. However, because certain interactional ties with family-of-origin had been modified in the process of migration, and in the light of arguments introducing this discussion, the opposite was expected, namely, less aid given by migrants to parental family. The latter difference is reflected in answers to the question: "During the past year, did you help your parents or other relatives with money or in any other way?" (Table 8). About 50 percent of the nonmigrants said "yes" as compared with only 31 percent of the migrants.

Table 8.— Help Given Parents or Relatives During Past Year, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Help Given	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Yes	79	50.3	47	31.3
No	78	49.7	103	68.7
Total	157	100.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 11.48$, DF = 1, $P < 0.01$

For the most part, help given went directly to parents; only about 15 percent of the help given in both cases went outside the immediate parental family.

As for the migrants, 41 percent of the help they gave was in the form of money but only 21 percent in some form of work exchange. In the case of nonmigrants, only 23 percent was in money form, whereas over 61 percent was work exchange. A variety of other types

of aid given made up the remainders in each case. The type of aid given again tended to reflect the economic situation of these areas.

These observations support the argument that modification of interactional ties with parental family tends to be accompanied by modification in supportive ties as well, at least in its economic aspects.[31] Whether an analogous loss of mutual interdependence occurs between the youth and his parents with respect to other kinds of social-psychological support or whether the results would be different if data were obtained from the wives of the men studied are questions beyond the scope of the present study. Nevertheless, functional separation as well as interactional separation from parental family has been shown to be a concomitant of migration.

Evidence of involvement by the migrant youth in nonparental and nonfamilial social structures in the areas to which he migrates would supply additional information about the nature of this "break" with family-of-origin. It may well be that the loss of functional and interactional connection between the youth and his parents was compensated for by other structural aspects of the "new" situation. In other words, a functional transference may have occurred in the process of transitional adjustment.

Nuclear Family Structure and Migration

As previously mentioned, migration and the marital status of these youths were associated. Migrants were more advanced in the family life cycle (Table 9). About 26 percent of the nonmigrants were unmarried as compared with only 12 percent of the migrants. About 27 percent of the married nonmigrants had no children as compared

Table 9.— Stage in Family Life Cycle of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Stage in Family Life Cycle	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Not married	40	25.6	17	11.5
Married, no children	31	19.9	22	14.9
Married, one child	45	28.9	50	33.8
Married, two or more children	40	25.6	59	39.8
Total	156	100.0	148	100.0

$X^2 = 14.46$, DF = 3, $P < 0.01$

[31] One should note that these observations agree with observations made earlier concerning the familistic orientation index. The content of statements used to construct that attitudinal index, in large measure, focuses upon the normative commitment of individuals to the supportive function of extended family. See footnote 18.

with only 17 percent of the married migrants. Furthermore, only about 35 percent of the married nonmigrants had two or more children, compared with 45 percent of the married migrants.

Since the two segments did not differ significantly in educational levels and because time in school, therefore, cannot be used to explain observed differences it appears that migration and stage in the family life cycle were related. Whether migration preceded establishment of a family or vice versa could not be ascertained from the available data.[32] Nevertheless, it is clear that the structural, spatial, and interactional separation of the migrant youth from his parental family could be compensated for, so to speak, by the transference of various extended family functions to the nuclear family.

Interaction With Parents-in-law and Migration

In the case of married youths, interregional migration probably meant the modification of certain ties with the spouse's family in much the same way as modification of ties with the parental home. Less than 8 percent of the married nonmigrant youths, compared with over 33 percent of the married migrants, married noneastern Kentucky girls. Thus, in almost all cases the married nonmigrant was involved in a sociocultural situation having the traditional familistic pattern, namely, proximity to parents-in-law as well as parents. On the other hand, two-thirds of the married migrants after migration, were spatially separated from the wife's family home. As a result, nearly 41 percent of the married migrants, compared with only about 8 percent of the married nonmigrants, visited the wife's parental family less often than once a month (Table 10). Yet, about a third of the married

Table 10.— Frequency of Visiting Wife's Parental Family, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960[a]

Frequency of Visiting Wife's Parents	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Daily [b/]	36	31.3	12	9.1
Weekly	57	49.6	28	21.2
Monthly	13	11.3	38	28.8
Less than monthly	9	7.8	54	40.9
Total [a/]	115	100.0	132	100.0

a/Married youths only.
b/Includes those living with parental-in-laws.
$X^2 = 65.36$, DF = 3, $P < 0.01$

[32] There was no difference between married migrants and married nonmigrants in terms of the number of years that they had been married ($X^2 = 0.91$, DF = 2, $P > 0.05$). About 60 percent of the study population who were married at the time these data were collected had been married for more than 3 years.

migrants were near enough to the wife's parents so that they visited weekly or more often with in-laws; this, for them, could compensate in part for the modification of ties with their own parental families.

Neighborhood Ties and Migration

Migrants are uprooted not only from their family but also from neighborhood and community relationships. The extent to which such relationships are replaced by similar relationships in the areas to which they migrate may have a crucial bearing upon whether the severance or modification of parental family ties will create structural strains within the migration system.

A comparison between migrants and nonmigrants can reflect only broad, general differences. An awareness of these differences, however, is useful for assessing the import of interactional separation from the parental family within the situational context encountered by migrants and, likewise, within the normative context of that situation.

In terms of frequency of interaction with relatives other than parents, migrants are less involved than nonmigrants (Table 11). The question was asked: "Counting visits to relatives other than your

Table 11.— Frequency of Visiting Relatives Other Than Parents, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Frequency of Visiting Relatives, Other Than Parents	Region of Residence, 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	31	20.6	64	41.0
Weekly	52	34.7	54	34.6
Monthly	33	22.0	19	12.2
Less than monthly	34	22.7	19	12.2
Total	150	100.0	156	100.0

$X^2 = 19.41$, $DF = 3$, $P < 0.01$

parents, as well as their visits to you, how often do you see them?" Nearly 21 percent of the migrants, compared with 41 percent of the nonmigrants, reported daily visiting. On the other hand, only about 24 percent of the nonmigrants, compared with about 45 percent of the migrants, reported monthly or less frequent visiting with other relatives. These data reflect the extensiveness of kinship visiting in the mountain way of life. Because almost half of the migrants found themselves relatively isolated from contacts with other kin suggests that they probably modified many kinship ties as well as parental family ties in the process of migration. Interaction with kinfolk is

the new area was probably not an important function in compensating for the modification of ties with the parental family.

In terms of the migrant's circle of friends, the situation is similar to that of kinfolk visiting. The question was asked: "How many close friends do you have in this area?" Although most of these young men reported a large number of close friends, the friendship circle for the migrants was considerably smaller than for the nonmigrants. About 20 percent of the migrants, compared with only 4 percent of the nonmigrants, said they had fewer than six close friends in the area (Table 12). No information is available about the nature of these friendship ties which did exist. Because the migrants did not have

Table 12.— Number of Close Friends in Area, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Number of Close Friends	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
0–5	9	5.8	29	19.8
6–10	6	3.8	22	15.0
11 or more	144	90.4	94	65.2
Total	159	100.0	146	100.0

$\chi^2 = 40.66$, DF = 2, $P < 0.01$

so many friends in the area as did the nonmigrants, friendship ties did not likely replace, to any great extent, the modification of family ties that occurred in the process of migration.

Finally, the situation with respect to membership in neighborhood and community formal organizations needs to be examined (Table 13). Over two-thirds of the nonmigrants did not belong to any secular organization.[10] For the most part, nonmigrants who reported some

Table 13.— Number of Secular Organization Memberships, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Number of Secular Organization Memberships	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
None	108	68.4	85	85.0
One	43	26.6	13	13.0
Two or more	13	7.9	1.0	1.0
Total	157	100.0	100	100.0

$\chi^2 = 17.46$, DF = 2, $P < 0.01$

[10] A secular organization is defined as any group with some formal structure, which can be identified by name, other than a church or church-affiliated organization.

formal group affiliations held memberships in athletic clubs, farm organizations or fraternal lodges. On the other hand, over half the migrants reported membership in some organization. Yet, upon closer inspection of these data, we find that formal social participation by migrants was, in the main, nominal; over two-thirds of these memberships were in the industrial unions of the area which, to a large extent, were compulsory. Thus, for the most part, migrants tended to conform to the cultural pattern, namely, membership in secular organizations is not an important activity.

Religious activity, however, is another matter in a rural familistic subculture. While a detailed description of mountain folkways regarding religion cannot be undertaken here, it can be stated summarily that religion, whether organized around the family group or around an informal neighborhood church, is an important element in the sociocultural fabric of rural eastern Kentucky.[34] For this reason, it is of particular interest to note that only 40 percent of the nonmigrants reported any church affiliations (Table 14); formal participation, even of a sacred nature, is not an activity which is characteristic of the culture.

Table 14.— Church Membership, Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Church Membership	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
No	94	59.9	128	85.3
Yes	63	40.1	22	14.7
Total	157	100.0	150	100.0

$X^2 = 24.76$, DF = 1, $P < 0.01$

As for migrants, only 15 percent reported any church affiliations. This is not to say that the migrants tended to be any less religious than those who did not migrate; there was no evidence for that conclusion. However, in view of these data, it does not appear likely that membership in formalized church organizations contributed substantial social and psychological group support during the migrant's period of transitional adjustment.

There was very little difference between migrants and nonmigrants in terms of total activity in both secular and church organizations as measured by a scoring technique which allows 1 point for nominal

[34] For a brief description of the nature of religious organization in the eastern Kentucky subculture, see Schwarzweller and Brown, "Education as a Cultural Bridge," *op. cit.*

membership, 2 for frequent attendance at meetings, and 3 for leadership activity of some kind (Table 15). The scoring is cumulative; for any one organization mentioned the highest possible score is 6 points. It is of interest then, that only 21 percent of the migrants and 17 percent of the nonmigrants scored 3 points or higher—a score that could be obtained by active membership in only one organization. Less than 5 percent of the entire study population scored more than 4 points on this index. In an economically deprived, familistic subculture, formal social participation has very little meaning for the average individual.

Table 15.— Social Participation Scores of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Region of Residence, 1960

Social Participation Score [a/]	Region of Residence 1960			
	Within E. Kentucky (nonmigrants)		Outside E. Kentucky (migrants)	
	No.	%	No.	%
None (0)	69	43.9	53	35.3
1-2	55	35.1	72	48.0
3 or more	33	21.0	25	16.7
Total	157	100.0	150	100.0

[a]/Participation in both secular and church organizations.
$X^2 = 5.27$, DF = 2, $P > 0.05$

Summary: Family Ties, Migration, and Nostalgia for Home

For the most part, migrants were separated from the parental household, whereas nearly a third of the nonmigrants lived with their parents. More important, however, a major proportion (68 percent) of the migrants lived over 100 miles from their families-of-origin, which thereby, considerably reduced the frequency of interaction; this was true in only a few cases of the nonmigrant segment.

Modification of interactional ties with the parental family was apparently accompanied by modification in supportive ties. Migrants not only received aid from their parents less frequently but also gave aid less frequently than did nonmigrants.

The research question is posed: "In this type of migration, does the associated reduction of face-to-face interaction with family-of-origin generate a structural strain within the migration system?" To the extent that familistic value orientations had been retained, it was hypothesized that such strains were generated.

In pursuing this question, it was assumed that other kinds of social structures than the parental family could perform integrative functions in the areas of destination which were performed ordinarily by the parental family in the areas of origin. The nuclear family, for example,

may perform such a function. A much larger proportion of the migrants were married and had children as compared with the nonmigrants. However, for only a small proportion of the migrant segment was it possible for reduction in interaction with parental family to be replaced by increased interaction with the in-law parents.

In terms of the frequency of interaction with relatives other than parents, migrants on the whole seemed much less involved than nonmigrants and, in fact, nearly half of the migrants reported monthly or less frequent visiting with other relatives. Likewise, the migrant's circle of friends was usually much smaller than was generally true for nonmigrants. But, almost all migrants reported some friends in the area other than kin.

Secular organizations seemed to have very little meaning for either migrants or nonmigrants. Except for union membership, which to a large extent is compulsory, few migrants belonged to formal groups that might serve to integrate them into the urban community. Furthermore, only 40 percent of the nonmigrants but only 15 percent of the migrants reported any church affiliations.

Based on these exploratory comparisons, the social situation of the migrant did not appear very favorable for replacing the extended family ties, severed or modified in the process of migration, with neighborhood and community ties that might perform compensating functions in the process of transitional adjustment.

Although the present study was not designed to investigate specifically the social-psychological ramification of spatial and interactional separation from parental family that occurs in this migration system, some indications can be gleaned. Feelings of residential stability are one such indication. About 60 percent of the men living more than 100 miles from parents, as compared with only about 30 percent of those living nearer, said they would like to move if they could (Table 16); in most cases (74 percent) the men in the first group who said they would like to move stated that they wanted to "go home to Kentucky." The relationship was demonstrated similarly

Table 16.— Residential Mobility Aspirations of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Nearness to Parental Home

Residential Mobility Aspiration	Nearness to Parental Home (in miles)							
	Living with Parents		Nearby, within 10 miles		11-100 miles		101 or more miles	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No	36	67.9	71	70.3	29	69.1	40	39.6
Yes	17	32.1	30	29.7	13	30.9	61	60.4
Total	53	100.0	101	100.0	42	100.0	101	100.0

$X^2 = 25.14$, DF = 3, $P < 0.01$

when frequency of interaction with parents was employed as the independent variable.[35] However, when the young men were asked to appraise their situations more realistically by stating expectations to move in the near future, no relationship was observed between nearness to parental home and mobility plans (Table 17). That is, both migrants and nonmigrants, appeared relatively stable, and settled.

Table 17.— Residential Mobility Plans of Young Men From Eastern Kentucky, by Nearness to Parental Home

Residential Mobility Plans	Nearness to Parental Home (in miles)							
	Living with Parents		Nearby, within 10 miles		11-100 miles		101 or more miles	
	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%	No.	%
No	38	73.1	83	84.7	31	75.6	78	81.3
Yes	14	26.9	15	15.3	10	24.4	18	18.7
Total	52	100.0	98	100.0	41	100.0	96	100.0

$X^2 = 3.53$, DF = 3, $P > 0.05$

This observation is supported also when frequency of interaction with parents is employed as the independent variable.[36] One concludes that two opposing forces, familism and the quest for economic opportunity were in delicate equilibrium in this migration system. In the case of the migrants, the yearning for "home" that persists as a latent social force would seemingly complicate the transitional adjustments of young rural migrants seeking work opportunities in urban, industrial areas. If so, one might expect that migrants identifying more closely with their family-of-origin would exhibit a greater degree of residential restlessness, social instability, and a lesser degree of upward social mobility.

The remainder of this report will focus primarily on those individuals who resided more than 100 miles from their parental homes (N = 103). These represented a particular kind of social situation within the migration system.

SECTION THREE: FAMILY TIES AND SOCIAL INTEGRATION OF MIGRANTS

In this section the proposition is explored that close identification with parental family, as manifested by frequent interaction with

[35] In this case, 57 percent of those men visiting monthly or less often compared with 31 percent of those visiting more frequently said they would like to move if they could ($X^2 = 19.07$, DF = 1, $P < 0.01$).

[36] In this case, 18 percent of those visiting monthly or less compared with 21 percent of those visiting more frequently said they expected to move in the near future ($X^2 = 0.34$, DF = 1, $P > 0.05$).

family-of-origin, tends to "hold back" the migrant from becoming socially integrated into the urban, industrial community. Concern is with those young men living more than 100 miles from parental homes; those reporting monthly or more frequent contact with parents are classed as "more familistic," whereas those maintaining less frequent contact are classed as "less familistic."

At first glance, one notes an apparent inconsistency between the argument posed here and that pursued in previous sections. The reader may ask, logically, how can one assert that modification of familial ties with parents represents a structural strain in the migration system, yet also suggest that the greater the degree of interaction with parents, in the case of youths living considerable distances from parental home, the less socially integrated these youths will be in the urban, industrial community and, therefore, the more transitional adjustment problems they will encounter? Would it not be more logical to expect that youths who lived away from parents but saw them more frequently would be less likely to manifest symptoms of stress than their counterparts who visited parents less frequently? Nevertheless, the propositions are not contradictory. In the preceding section concern was centered on the *nature of* this strain-producing situation. We were dealing with the total study population and operating under the assumption that the familistic orientation was not altered much by intervening experiences after migration.[37] An attempt was made to assess the situation confronting these migrants, and in the summary of the previous section observations were stated which indicated that the situation analyzed was producing social-psychological stress of some kind.

Now, in this section, the strain-producing situation was held constant by dealing with a segment of the study population residing considerable distances away from parental homes. Thus, it was possible to take into account individual variations away from the dominant familistic pattern and to study the effect these had upon the social integration of those youths into the urban, industrial community. It was hypothesized that migrants classed as "less familistic" were more adaptable and better able to cope with the strain-producing situation they encountered than their "more familistic" counterparts.

The basic assumption was that interaction is a major prerequisite

---

[37] The reader will recall that some evidence was presented which indicates that the familistic orientation is modified, to some degree, by intervening experiences after migration.

for primary group cohesion.[38] It was assumed that young men who maintain greater contact with the parental family also maintained closer identification with it.[39] One should note that such identification is only one dimension of the larger concept, "familism."

If the youth who visited more often with his parental family was more familistic than his counterpart who visited less often, then it could be expected also that he would exhibit more familistic attitudes. However, employing the familistic orientation index described earlier no difference was observed ($X^2 = 0.38$, DF $= 1$, $P > 0.05$). Methodological weaknesses inherent in the familistic orientation index have been indicated, and any conclusions, therefore, on the basis of this analysis must be highly tentative. Value orientations may change more slowly than changes in behavior which are situationally induced in the process of transition from a rural familistic subculture to an urban, industrial society.[40] In that sense, frequency of interaction with parental family represents a more useful measure of "familism" than attitude because it would tap more subtle changes in orientation occurring within the relatively short period of time that these young men have been away from home.[41]

Compensatory Structures in the Transition Process

The concept "social integration," as employed here, implies the extent to which the young migrant became involved in the social life of the urban, industrial community. Such involvement may be with nonfamilistic type structures in the urban community that induce changes in the migrant's patterns of behavior and values which, in turn, enable him to cope more effectively with the demands of an

---

[38] George C. Homans, *The Human Group*, New York: Harcourt, Brace, 1950, p. 36.

[39] Those young men who maintained less face-to-face contact with parental family may have modified the form of their relationships. While identification with parental family may not be so strong (as close), intergenerational family continuity may still exist in the new situation even though modification of family ties has occurred. For a comprehensive treatment of intergenerational family continuity, see: Marvin B. Sussman and Lee G. Burchinal, "Kin-Family Network: Unheralded Structure in Current Conceptualizations of Family Functioning," *Marriage and Family Living*, 24 (August 1962), 231-240.

[40] The specific content of the familistic orientation index should be considered. This attitudinal content may not be of the same order of things as the desire to maintain close identification with parental family by frequent face-to-face interaction. Both aspects, however, can be included under the large concept "familism."

[41] Throughout the remaining portions of this report, parallel analyses were conducted using the familistic orientation index as an independent variable in place of the behavioral indicator, frequency of interaction with parental family. In no case do these results contradict the findings reported here.

urban, industrial society. Many new migrants, however, may find themselves in situations that are structurally similar and functionally equivalent to the familistic rural situations in their communities-of-origin and which, thereby, would compensate for the modification of parental ties. The migrant's involvement in such compensatory structures must be considered as a special kind of social integration.[42] This type of social integration would tend to hold back the migrant from becoming a functional member of the urban society if the kinds of values and behavioral patterns which are reinforced by compensatory structures are incompatible with the demands of a modern, complex industrial order.

The reader will remember that we are dealing with migrants who resided more than 100 miles from their parental homes and we are concerned with certain differences between those who visited parents frequently and those who visited parents less frequently.

Less than 7 percent of these men were not married; nearly all unmarried migrants visited their parents once a month or more frequently. Over two-thirds of the married migrants married girls with home ties in eastern Kentucky whose parents also lived more than 100 miles from the migrant's present residence.

In the case of married migrants there was a positive correlation between frequency of visiting parents and frequency of visiting in-laws (Table 18). The unusual shape of this relationship is explained by the migrant's spatial distance from in-laws. Married migrants living

Table 18.— Frequency of Visiting Parents-in-Law, Married Migrant Men Residing More Than 100 Miles From Their Parental Home, by Frequency of Visiting Their Own Parents

Frequency of Visiting Parents-in-Law	Frequency of Visiting Parents			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
Weekly or more often	12	27.3	15	30.0
Monthly	29	65.9	1	2.0
Less than monthly	3	6.8	34	68.0
Total	44	100.0	50	100.0

$X^2 = 52.39$, DF = 2, $P < 0.01$

near the spouse's parents visited them frequently regardless of how frequently they visited their own parents. If married migrants lived considerable distances from in-laws, than those who visited their own parents frequently also visited their in-laws frequently, and vice versa.

[42] One should note that the concept "compensatory structure" is used here in a more specific sense than earlier in the report. However, both usages connote essentially the same meaning.

The almost straight-line relationship in the latter instance (Table 18) is because, for the most part, if the youth's in-laws did not reside in the area *to which* he had migrated, then they were living in the areas from which he had migrated. What is clear from these observations is that for less than a third of these migrants the parental-in-law relationship could perform a compensatory role in the transition process; there was, however, no evidence that it did.

Of the married migrants, only 14 percent had no children. Thus, we were dealing with a small number of cases who were in the pre-children stage of the family life cycle (Table 19). Theoretically, one would expect that those individuals who had children of their own

Table 19.— Stage in Family Life Cycle of Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Stage in Family Life Cycle	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
Not married	6	12.2	1	-
Married, no children	8	16.3	6	11.8
Married, one or more children	35	71.5	44	86.3
Total	49	100.0	51	100.0

(If the categories "not married" and "married, no children" are combined then $X^2 = 3.30$, DF = 1, $P > 0.05$)

would tend to modify ties with parental homes.[43] Although a trend in these data was in that direction, the number of cases having no children was too small for generalization; differences were not statistically significant. In effect, the situation of these migrants with respect to stage in the family life cycle was that in more than 80 percent of the cases the family-of-procreation could perform a compensatory function in the transition process; there was, however little evidence that it did. One should note again, however, the obvious fact that almost all of the small number of unmarried migrants visited parents frequently.

Since the destination of rural eastern Kentucky outmigrants was influenced, to some extent, by kinship ties in the receiving areas it is likely that the modification of interactional ties with the family-of-origin might have been compensated for by involvement with other kin in the receiving areas.[44] The corollary hypothesis also is of interest in the sense that involvement with other kin in these areas

[43] The reader should be aware that it is the *form* of this relationship which is of concern. See: Sussman and Burchinal, "Kin-Family Network," *op. cit.*

[44] See Brown, Schwarzweller, and Mangalam, "Kentucky Mountain Migration and the Stem Family," *op. cit.*

might have tended to perpetuate the familistic orientation which, in turn, would have been manifested by increased interaction with family-of-origin. The latter argument, of course, is implicit throughout this discussion of possible compensatory structures in the areas of destination.

As explained earlier, the question was asked: "Counting visits to relatives other than your parents or your wife's parents, as well as their visits to you, how often do you see them?" No significant difference between the more familistic youths compared with the less familistic was revealed in response to this question (Table 20). Frequency of interaction with parental family did not appear to have any connection with frequency of interaction with other kinsfolk.

Table 20.— Frequency of Visiting Relatives Other Than Parents, Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Frequency of Visiting Relatives	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
Daily	16	31.4	9	17.6
Weekly	16	31.4	20	39.3
Monthly	15	29.4	10	19.6
Less than monthly	4	7.8	12	23.5
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0

$X^2 = 7.40$, DF = 3, P> 0.05

Nevertheless, some significant trends were observed (Table 20). First, a much larger proportion of youths who visited parents monthly or more often also reported daily contact with other kin. Second, a much larger proportion of youths who visited parents less often than monthly also reported less than monthly visiting with other kin. These trends lend support to the corollary hypothesis, namely, that the greater the degree of involvement in the kinship structure, the greater the reinforcement of a familistic orientation, and vice versa.

In summarizing the preceding discussion, one must emphasize again that we have been exploring a special kind of "social integration." The involvement of the young migrant in various social situations may replace or compensate for the modification of interactional ties with family-of-origin and such "compensatory structures" could perform social and psychological supportive functions in the process of transitional adjustment.

Only one instance is found where that hypothesis tends to be supported. Six unmarried migrants visit parental homes frequently, whereas only one unmarried migrant visits less frequently. An

empirical generalization, however, cannot be based upon so few cases; the difference is not statistically significant, of course.

In all other instances, the initial hypothesis is not only rejected, but there are noteworthy trends in these data which suggest that the reverse may be true, namely, that greater involvement in familistic-type structures tends to reinforce the familistic behavior of the migrant. This, in turn, strengthens confidence in the use of frequency of interaction with parental family as a valid indicator of familistic orientation.

Extra-Familial Group Involvement and Family Ties

While the young migrant in the process of transitional adjustment may find himself involved in familistic-type structures in the new situation which help compensate for the reduction of face-to-face interaction with parental family, he may also become more socially integrated into the larger community through involvement in extra-familial groups. In that case, one would expect that the less familistic migrant would be more involved in such groups external to his family-kinship group than his more familistic counterpart. Family ties, in other words, would tend to hold back the migrant from becoming socially integrated into the urban, industrial community. Within the limits of available data, however, this did not appear to be true.

In terms of number of close friends in the area, the less familistic migrant did not report a larger friendship circle than his counterpart (Table 21). One should note that in almost two-thirds of the cases more than 10 close friends were indicated; for the most part, these young men were neither socially isolated nor confined to the kinship group in establishing friendship ties.

Table 21.— Number of Close Friends in Area, Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Number of Close Friends in Area	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
Ten or less	19	38.0	18	36.0
Eleven or more	31	62.0	32	64.0
Total	50	100.0	50	100.0

$X^2 = 0.04$, DF = 1, P>0.05

In terms of church affiliation, however, the general situation was quite different. As shown earlier, migrants were far less active in church organizations than nonmigrants. This is reflected again in the fact that only about 12 percent of the migrants reported church mem-

bership (Table 22). There was no significant difference between the more familistic and less familistic migrants, although a very slight trend in these data could be noted.

Table 22.— Church Membership, Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Church Membership	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
No	47	92.2	42	84.0
Yes	4	7.8	8	16.0
Total	51	100.0	50	100.0

$X^2 = 1.67$, DF = 1, $P > 0.05$

The situation in terms of memberships in secular organizations was quite similar to that of church affiliation, even though at first glance this would not appear to be true (Table 23). About 44 percent of the migrant youths did not belong to any formal organization.

Table 23.— Number of Secular Organization Memberships, Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Homes

Number of Secular Organization Memberships	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
None	20	39.2	24	48.0
One or more	31	60.8	26	52.0
Total	51	100.0	50	100.0

$X^2 = 0.78$, DF = 1, $P > 0.05$

Over two-thirds of the others belonged only to a union which, in their situation, was largely compulsory. The remaining memberships, involving about 20 percent of these migrants, were in athletic clubs or fraternal lodges. Thus, activity in formal social organizations was not very extensive and, one might add, apparently not very meaningful. There was no significant difference in that respect between the more familistic and less familistic migrants.

In summary, degree of familistic behavior did not make any difference in the extent of the migrant's involvement in either the informal or formal structure of the social situation external to the kinship structure. It appears, therefore, that the less familistic migrants had "sloughed-off" extended family ties without, as yet, substituting

more diffuse associations (less familistic) characteristic of social integration into urban society.[45]

Residential Stability and Family Ties

Implicit in the concept of social integration is the notion of psychological involvement or identification with a larger social structure such as the community. If family ties tend to hold back the migrant from becoming socially integrated into the urban community, then the more familistic migrants would exhibit greater degrees of residential restlessness, nostalgia for home, and dissatisfaction with the new community.

While only 19 percent of the migrants in this subsegment of the study population said they *expected* to move in the near future, over 60 percent said they'd *like* to move if they could. In most cases (74 percent), those who aspired to move said they wanted to "go home to Kentucky."

A significantly greater proportion of the more familistic migrants expressed definite plans to move, as compared with their less familistic counterparts (Table 24). Although not statistically significant, the direction of relationship was similar for migration

Table 24.— Residential Mobility Plans of Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles from Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Residential Mobility Plan	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
No	54	79.9	44	91.7
Yes	14	20.5	4	8.3
Total a/	68	100.0	48	100.0

a/ Six responses not ascertainable, evenly distributed in both categories.

$\chi^2 = 2.04$, $DF = 1$, $P < 0.05$

aspirations (Table 25). A significantly larger proportion of the more familistic migrants rated their present county of residence less favorably than "good" as a place to live (Table 26). Likewise, in rating other more specific aspects of living in their present county of residence, observed relationships, while not significant in statistical terms, all tended toward the same direction, namely, that a larger proportion of the more familistic migrants were more dissatisfied.

[45] While it is clear from these data that there were no differences manifested as yet, it does not follow necessarily that such differences, arising from a familistic orientation pattern will not be manifested at a later stage in the migrant's career. These young men, it must be remembered, were recent migrants and had been out of school a relatively short time.

Table 25.— Residential Mobility Aspiration of Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Residential Mobility Aspiration	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
No	16	31.4	23	46.9
Yes	35	68.6	26	53.1
Total	51	100.0	49	100.0

$X^2 = 2.56$, DF = 1, P > 0.05

Table 26.— Percent of Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Home Who Rate Present County of Residence "Good" or "Very Good" in Terms of Indicated Criteria, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Rating County as a Place	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home		X^2 (test of difference)
	Monthly or More, % Favorable	Less Than Monthly, % Favorable	
a) to live	68.6	86.0	4.36*
b) to raise a family	58.0	76.0	3.66
c) to make many close friends	49.0	60.8	1.99
d) to find opportunities for work	60.8	74.0	2.03
	No.=51	No.=50	

*Significant at the 0.05 level; all others are nonsignificant.

These results suggested that familism, as measured by frequency of interaction with parents, tended to be negatively associated with residential stability and, in that sense, tended to hold back the migrant from becoming socially integrated into the urban community. One should be aware, however, that an alternative explanation also is plausible. Migrants who found themselves in unfavorable circumstances in the areas of destination might compensate for this frustration by increased interaction with their family-of-origin.

Anomia and Family Ties

Anomie refers to the normative disorganization of a society.[46] The equivalent concept from the point of view of a personality system is called, generally, "anomia."[47] Anomia refers to an individual's state of mind with respect to his own integration into the societal structure. In that sense, the more anomic individual manifests symptoms of normlessness, hopelessness, helplessness, and the like, in the face of

[46] Emile Durkheim, *Suicide*, translated by John A. Spaulding and George Simpson, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, 1951.

[47] Lee Srole, "Social Integration and Certain Corollaries: An Exploratory Study," *American Sociological Review*, 21 (Dec. 1956), pp. 709-716.

impersonal social forces which he feels are beyond his control. The anomic individual would have very little faith in the future and would be extremely pessimistic to the point of despair.

A commonly employed measure of this personality condition is the Srole Anomia Scale. Five attitudinal items were included in the present study:

(1) Its hardly fair to bring children into the world with the way things look for the future.
(2) Nowadays, a person has to live pretty much for today and let tomorrow take care of itself.
(3) In spite of what some people say, the lot of the average man is getting worse, not better.
(4) There's little use in writing to public officials because they often aren't really interested in the problems of the average man.
(5) These days a person doesn't really know whom he can count on.

Extent of agreement with the items is employed as a measure of anomia. These items formed an acceptable six-point Guttman-type scale with a coefficient of reproducibility of 90.4 percent.[48]

Although a plausible argument can be formulated to support the hypothesis that anomia is inversely related to familism that argument does not take into full account the nature of the social situation confronting these young men. All of these youths were geographically separated from their parental homes and few of them were involved to any extent in familistic type structures which could compensate for this separation from parental families. Few were tied into the on-going social life of the urban, industrial community. All were in the early stages of their careers and, likewise, in the early stages of the transitional adjustment process. For these reasons, the exploratory hypothesis was posed that anomia is positively related to familism. The young man who modified his familistic orientation and identification with parental family in the process of transitional adjustment would be more likely to feel tied into and part of the larger, more abstract societal structure, than would his counterpart, the more familistic migrant.

Data in Table 27 tend to support this hypothesis. About 22 percent of the more familistic migrants were included in the more

[48] See Robert N. Ford, "A Rapid Scoring Procedure For Scaling Attitude Questions," Chapter 12 in M. Riley, J. Riley, and J. Toby, *Sociological Studies in Scale Analysis*, Rutgers University Press, New Brunswick, N. J., 1954, pp. 273-305.

Table 27— Anomia Scale Score of Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Anomia Scale Score	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
0, 1 (Low Anomic)	24	47.0	22	43.1
2, 3	16	31.4	25	49.0
4, 5 (High Anomic)	11	21.6	4	7.9
Total	51	100.0	51	100.0

$X^2 = 5.33$, DF = 2, P > 0.05

anomic category as compared with only 8 percent of the less familistic migrants. With such a small number of cases, however, this difference is not statistically significant; the argument remains tentative.

Occupational Achievement and Family Ties

Recently several questions have been raised concerning the compatability of familism and an extended family structure with the demands of a modern, complex industrial order.[49]

Implicit in these arguments is the notion that extended family ties interfere with the upward social mobility of individual workers; that is, familism puts a damper, so to speak, on status aspirations and achievement maneuverability by limiting the flexibility and performance of the individual worker. For example, migrants from a familistic, low-income area may retain the family group back in the old neighborhood as their reference group, and with this perspective they may be "doing well" if by simply drawing high wages from a semi-skilled job they can acquire those material amenities that are scarce "back home" in the low-income area. Thus, one would expect that the less familistic migrants would attain higher levels of accomplishment in the occupational structure of the industrial area than their more familistic counterparts, and in that sense familism would tend to "hold back" the migrant from becoming socially integrated into the urban, industrial community.

However, this did not appear to be the case here. Measuring the level of occupational achievement by utilizing two categories, (a) white collar and skilled, (b) semi-skilled and unskilled, and comparing the more familistic with the less familistic migrants in this respect revealed that there was a very slight trend in the expected direction,

[49] See Talcott Parsons, *op. cit.* and Eugene Litwak, *op. cit.* (Footnote 9).

but it was not significant (Table 28).[50] Likewise, when occupations were classified by the North-Hatt Scale in terms of "prestige," no significant difference between the more familistic and less familistic migrants was revealed (Table 29); in fact, the trend in these data was reversed.[51] These findings suggest that at this stage in the migrant's career, the familistic orientation had not held back the migrant's career attainment. One cannot reject the hypothesis, however, simply on the basis of these findings. Further research is necessary which deals with migrants at various stages in work careers.[52]

Table 28.— Occupational Status of Job Held, Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Occupational Status [a/]	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
White collar or skilled	13	26.0	16	32.7
Semi-skilled or unskilled	37	74.0	33	67.3
Total	50	100.0	49	100.0

[a/] Jobs classified according to the Edward's Scale, utilizing the Dictionary of Occupational Titles, U. S. Census.

$X^2 = 0.50$, DF = 1, $P > 0.05$

Table 29.— Occupational Prestige of Job Held, Migrants Residing More Than 100 Miles From Parental Homes, by Frequency of Visiting Parental Home

Occupational Prestige [a/]	Frequency of Visiting Parental Home			
	Monthly or More Often		Less Than Monthly	
	No.	%	No.	%
High (score 60 or above)	30	61.2	26	55.3
Low (score below 60)	19	38.8	21	44.7
Total	49	100.0	47	100.0

[a/] Jobs classified according to the North-Hatt Scale

$X^2 = 0.34$, DF = 1, $P > 0.05$

[50] Jobs were classified according to a method suggested by: A. M. Edwards, *Population: Comparative Occupation Statistics for the United States, 1870 to 1940*, U. S. Bureau of the Census, Washington: U. S. Government Printing Office, 1943.

[51] A description of the North-Hatt Scale is found in: "Jobs and Occupations: A Popular Evaluation," a chapter in Reinhard Bendex and Seymour Lipset, *Class, Status and Power*, Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press of Glencoe, Inc., 1953, pp. 411-426.

[52] It may be of interest to note that of this segment of the study population (youths residing 100 or more miles from parents), only 8 percent indicated some degree of dislike for their present job.

SECTION FOUR: SUMMARY FAMILY TIES, MIGRATION, AND TRANSITIONAL ADJUSTMENT

This study focused on a population of young men reared in eastern Kentucky, a traditionally familistic, low-income rural area of the Southern Appalachian Region. Ten years after enrollment in the eighth grades, a large number of these youths had migrated and established residence in areas outside of eastern Kentucky.

Prior to migration, potential migrants and nonmigrants apparently did not differ very greatly in family background characteristics or in their commitment to familistic norms; situationally-induced factors may have had more bearing upon an individual's decision to migrate than "familism."

For the most part, migrants not only were structurally separated but also spatially separated by considerable distances from parental families which greatly reduced frequency of interaction. Migration also was associated with modification of the mutual supportive function of the extended family system. This break with parental family suggests a source of structural strain within the migration system.

Comparisons between the migrant and nonmigrant segments demonstrate that the social situation of the migrant is not very favorable for replacing family ties, modified in the process of migration, with neighborhood and community ties that might perform integrative functions in the process of transitional adjustment. Young men who were separated by considerable distance from families-of-origin manifested greater feelings of residential instability than their counterparts, who lived nearer to parents. Their yearning for home seemed to be more than simple nostalgia; it also suggested the existence of a potentially disruptive source of strain in the migration system. Two opposing forces, familism and the quest for economic opportunity, appeared in delicate equilibrium in this situation.

By holding the strain-producing situation constant (dealing with only those youths who resided considerable distances from parental homes), the effect of variations in familistic behavior on the social integration of migrant youths into the urban, industrial community was explored. Frequency of interaction with parents was employed as a behavioral indicator of familism.

Involvement with in-laws and other kinsfolk in the new communities did not appear to perform compensating functions in the transitional adjustment process. To the contrary, these familistic-type structures appeared to reinforce the familistic behavior pattern.

Furthermore, frequency of interaction with parental family was not associated with extent of the migrant's involvement in either the informal or formal extra-familial social network in the new community, or the level of achievement attained in the occupational structure—at least at this early point in the migrant's career.

While individual adherence to a familistic behavioral pattern did not appear to affect the social integration of migrants in the new community, it did show certain social-psychological manifestations of strain within the migration system. On the whole, the more familistic migrants, compared with their less familistic counterparts, tended to be tied into the societal structure to a lesser degree, in terms of their feelings about the new community as a place to live and their orientation to society as an abstract entity. However, these generalizations are highly tentative since they are based upon trend patterns in these data and not upon statistically significant results for all contributing items.

In conclusion, familism seemed to generate a feeling of "rootlessness" on the part of migrants—a somewhat nostalgic attachment to parents and extended family homestead which caused migrants to identify more with the home area than with the urban community and, thereby, reinforced the migrant's definition of his situation as one of transciency rather than permanency.

On the other hand, it appeared that in this early stage of the migrant's career development extended family ties did not hold back the transitional adjustment process to any measurable degree; it is plausible that the extended family structure may actually perform a supportive function in the process, facilitating the move and the migrant's adaptation to the new situation.

Further research is necessary before more substantive generalizations are possible.[53] However the general problem of the functional interrelationships between family structure and economic system, and the more specific problem of the interplay between familism and social mobility, will certainly attract wider attention in the future as structural strains generated by rapid economic development programs and extensive streams of rural to urban migration become more manifest in many areas of the world.

---

[53] Future research dealing with the concept "familism" might do well to consider the use of a "control group" or other techniques for validation of the independent variable.